



## RECENT LITERATURE ON MEASURING IMPACT: ADVOCACY, COMMUNITY ORGANIZING, AND CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

By  
**Lisa Ranghelli**  
*Senior Research Associate*

Many grantmakers already provide substantial support for policy advocacy, community organizing and civic engagement as a way to address long-term needs of marginalized groups. Yet, a sizable number of grantmakers have not seriously considered how investing in this work could increase the impact of their funding. While there has been much discussion in philanthropic circles about the need for greater support of advocacy and organizing, there has not been significant movement in the total percentage of foundation funding directed at these efforts. One barrier commonly cited is that grantmakers have difficulty understanding or demonstrating the connection between funding for advocacy or organizing and tangible improvements in people's lives.

The Grantmaking for Community Impact Project (GCIP) will highlight the positive impact that communities have seen through funder-supported nonprofit advocacy and organizing. NCRP will release a series of reports that uses quantitative and qualitative methods to measure impact, drawing on the latest advances in advocacy evaluation, organizing outcome measurement, and the positive returns to social capital from civic engagement. A key component of NCRP's approach is calculating an aggregate return on investment for all organizing, advocacy and civic engagement impacts that can be quantified for a set of organizations.

This document describes some of the theoretical frameworks and methods for measuring the impact of civic engagement, policy advocacy, and community organizing. This literature review draws on social capital literature, extensive work in the field on evaluating advocacy, and recent efforts to quantify the outcomes of community organizing.

### Historical Role of Nonprofits in Civil Society

Advocacy, organizing, and civic engagement by the nonprofit sector have played essential roles in our society. Early in our nation's history, Alexis de Tocqueville distinguished the U.S. from Europe in its abundance of voluntary associations, mutual aid societies, and institutions that addressed the needs and petitioned for the rights of various constituencies. These entities evolved into the nonprofit sector, and their right of free speech was upheld in the First Amendment to the Constitution. Historically, the right of groups to organize and advocate was exercised to protest the relocation of Native Americans, seek the abolition of slavery, improve working conditions, and secure civil rights for women and African Americans.<sup>1</sup> As the social capital review below describes, voluntary associations have played a critical role to secure policies and programs that benefited many vulnerable members of society, such as veterans and widows.

The importance of this role has been reaffirmed in contemporary times. In 2000, the Aspen Institute formed the Nonprofit Sector Strategy Group, with distinguished representatives from across the ideological spectrum, to explore the role of nonprofits in civic participation and advocacy. This diverse group, whose members ranged from Pablo Eisenberg at Georgetown Public Policy Institute to Elaine Chao, then at the Heritage Foundation, agreed unanimously that

advocacy is a fundamental function of the nonprofit sector, and one that must be encouraged in the future. The group stated further that “nonprofit participation in the policy process takes advantage of the special insights, competencies, and perspectives that nonprofit organizations have by virtue of their involvement with important societal issues and their ties to a wide range of different social groups, including many that might otherwise be excluded from involvement in public affairs.” Participants agreed there were many benefits to nonprofit engagement in policy advocacy, including bringing public attention to key social issues, increasing the base of knowledge for sound policy formation, ensuring access for new and unheard constituencies, fostering government accountability, promoting democratic values, and giving people civic skills and a sense of community attachment.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, it is all the more disturbing that advocacy and civic engagement have been threatened by underfunding and other challenges. Community groups struggle to raise the resources needed to engage in this important work. In a 2005 report, Independent Sector and the Foundation Center found that grant making for structural change efforts that benefit the least well off in society comprised a meager 11 percent of total grants in 1998 and 2002.<sup>3</sup> In the words of Andrew Friedman, co-director of Brooklyn-based Make the Road by Walking, “It’s really frustrating, because we are winning concrete victories that affect the lives of literally hundreds of thousands of immigrants in New York City, and now we have been unable to secure the funding to expand our efforts.”<sup>4</sup> Several attempts by some members of Congress to curtail nonprofit advocacy over the last dozen years have had an equally chilling effect.<sup>5</sup> Also, as more community organizations have gotten involved in voter registration and turnout efforts with underrepresented constituencies in recent years, their efforts have been thwarted by problems at the polls, such as long lines, faulty electronic balloting systems, and purged voter lists, which have impeded the ability of many residents to vote. Recent court rulings upheld restrictive photo identification requirements that may further prevent people from exercising their right to vote.<sup>6</sup> These obstacles disproportionately affect lower-income voters, immigrants, the elderly, and voters of color. Now more than ever, grassroots organizations play a critical role in protecting and asserting the role of marginalized communities in our civil society.

### Social Capital and Civic Engagement

In the last dozen years, the topic of social capital and its apparent decline in the United States has been widely explored, largely by and in response to Robert D. Putnam, whose article and subsequent book *Bowling Alone*<sup>7</sup> brought the concept into mainstream discourse. Putnam defined social capital as connections among individuals, social networks, and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them. He distinguished between “bonding” forms of social capital that strengthen connections within a group and can be exclusive and “bridging” forms that strengthen connections between groups and generally are inclusive. Putnam noted the negative potential of social capital, especially in its bonding form, as when a group unites to oppose or oppress others.

Why should funders and nonprofit organizations care about social capital? Research has demonstrated the many benefits of social capital for individuals and society. Strong social capital is associated with positive child outcomes, low crime rates, economic prosperity, improved physical and mental health, and good government.<sup>8</sup> Importantly, social capital has contributed to enhanced participatory democracy and policy innovation. Historically, voluntary associations and their federations built bridges across race, class, and religion, countering the intolerance that often existed in local “bonding” organizations. These federations were highly effective at fostering public discussion and mobilizing millions of people to achieve significant national policy

outcomes, including land grant college programs, veterans' services, and the GI Bill of 1944, which benefited broad swaths of society.<sup>9</sup>

Unfortunately, social capital appears to have declined over the last quarter century.<sup>10</sup> Putnam largely blamed television watching, urban sprawl, changes in family dynamics associated with women entering the workforce, busier lives, and greater economic pressures. Others attributed the decline to more systemic changes, such as the growth of multinational corporations, globalization of the economy, erosion of the welfare state, growing income and wealth inequality and media consolidation.<sup>11</sup> Theda Skocpol described the shift during the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s from voluntary associations to agile professional advocacy organizations that came to rely more on "inside the Beltway" lobbying and media work than on mobilizing a membership base to achieve their goals. She argued that the new civic landscape was "oligarchic" because foundation grants favored professional groups over grassroots ones, advocacy groups had no impetus to appeal to or mobilize a mass base, there was little bridge-building across class, and as a result, bottom-up policies benefiting working class and poor constituencies were drowned out in Congress.

Several authors<sup>12</sup> have affirmed the role of community organizing and mobilization in fostering civic engagement, an area completely ignored by Putnam in *Bowling Alone*.<sup>13</sup> Herman and Renz have demonstrated a correlation between stakeholder engagement and organizational effectiveness. Nonprofits that can engage with and respond to stakeholders are better positioned to achieve their mission than those that do not.<sup>14</sup> The harms of civic *dis*-engagement are felt the most in lower-income urban communities, and evidence indicates that strong community organizations that empower residents contribute to higher levels of political and civic engagement than can be found in communities with more resources. During the quarter century of decline documented by Putnam, urban communities experienced a burgeoning of community organizing groups, community development corporations, and neighborhood associations. Many of these groups have evolved from a confrontational approach to more sophisticated relationship-building that leverages a web of connections to public and private actors and an ability to mobilize lower-income residents. Their links to regional and national infrastructures allow for sharing of knowledge and capacity. Community organizing groups often develop innovative policy proposals that are as important as the groups' civic engagement impacts, but they rarely get credit for these policies. These groups also yield benefits for their communities, as exemplified by the successful living wage movement and widespread school reform efforts. The environmental movement, energized labor movement, and faith-based community organizing are examples of the revival of federated voluntary associations, but they need long-term investment to achieve lasting impact. According to Skocpol, "It takes time to connect leaders and members to one another across places and institutions; yet this is the only way to draw large numbers of people into a movement and best way to generate sustained leverage to make a difference beyond one issue battle or election."<sup>15</sup>

Community organizing and advocacy groups know the importance of civic engagement and social capital for their communities and for effectively creating change, which is why building "bonding" relationships among members and, increasingly, "bridging" relationships with other constituencies, is an important aspect of their work. For example, Warren and Wood's 2001 report, *Faith-based Community Organizing: The State of the Field*,<sup>16</sup> documented the breadth of faith-based community organizing (FBCO) and the important role that FBCO groups play to bring ordinary people from diverse backgrounds into the democratic process. The authors found that FBCO groups collectively reached between 1 and 3 million people across the country. They trained 1,600 people in leadership development, included nearly 2,700 people on their governing

boards, engaged 24,000 core leaders, and drew roughly 100,000 people to their public events and actions during an 18-month period. The staffs, boards and memberships of these FBCO groups were racially and ethnically diverse and involved immigrant communities. More than half also brought non-congregational institutions, such as labor unions, public schools, and neighborhood associations, into their membership.

### Organizing Outcomes and Impact

Over the last decade, concerted efforts by key organizations, foundations, and researchers have resulted in a rich body of literature that looks at ways to assess and document the impacts of organizing. NCRP's GCIP approach draws on some of the latest thinking in these areas.

Recent research has made a significant contribution in the area of **measuring leadership development** and the skills gained by residents who participate in community organizing, bringing rigor to an area that often is viewed as intangible and amorphous, despite the central role leadership development plays in organizing. For People Improving Communities through Organizing (PICO), a faith-based network, Paul Speer devised and implemented a methodology to measure the public policy leadership skills of PICO leaders in California.<sup>17</sup> Speer surveyed leaders of California PICO, a statewide PICO project, local PICO leaders in Los Angeles, ordinary residents who attended church, and residents who did not attend church. The survey gauged respondents' understanding of public policy, cognitive understanding of power, and emotional feelings of power. Speer found a statistically significant difference in policy skills, knowledge and experience between PICO leaders and ordinary residents. PICO leaders were more knowledgeable about the policy process than ordinary residents, felt more competent in leadership roles and more effective in their ability to change policies. They also scored higher in their understanding of the source of power in collective rather than individual action and the role of conflict in exercising power to achieve social change. Overall, California PICO leaders scored significantly higher than local PICO leaders in their understanding of public policy.

Heidi Swarts<sup>18</sup> also measured leadership capacity and political efficacy for her comparative study of FBCO and secular, individual-member organizations. She interviewed 75 activists across four groups to gauge their strategic knowledge and sophistication in political skills. She asked respondents if they had attended leadership training, and whether they had learned to speak in public, chair meetings, conduct research on issues, plan strategy, or other skills. Swarts also asked them about their feelings of empowerment and political efficacy. In all four groups, activists reported having little confidence or experience in strategic political activism *before* getting involved, and the majority felt much more empowered to create change *after* having participated in their respective organization.

Another area of interesting work has been **quantifying the impacts of organizing**. The Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) sought to demonstrate its impact by quantifying in dollars as many of its campaign victories as possible over a ten-year period.<sup>19</sup> The research drew on methodologies developed by experts in specific issue areas, such as predatory lending and living wages, and in other cases relied on staff to provide the data and calculation methods. The cumulative impacts were impressive—more than \$15 billion in benefits to low and moderate income residents between 1995 and 2004. The majority of the benefits were the result of policy victories achieved through organizing, and the rest were direct services provided by ACORN Housing or ACORN chapters, such as loan counseling, free tax preparation, and assistance claiming the Earned Income Tax Credit. More than \$12 billion of the ten-year total

amount related to curbing predatory lending practices, securing home mortgages, and other financial services.

Swarts' recent book on secular and faith-based organizing<sup>20</sup> went further, documenting the impacts of ACORN, PICO, and the Gamaliel Foundation, another FBCO network. Swarts studied an ACORN affiliate and a PICO affiliate in San Jose, as well as an ACORN affiliate and a Gamaliel affiliate in St. Louis. She compared the four local organizations in five areas:

- (1) Organizational strength, including mobilization capacity, leadership continuity, organizational reputation, regular access to authorities, and ability to influence political and policy agendas.
- (2) Civic engagement and political action, especially among underrepresented groups.
- (3) Advancing issues important to poor Americans.
- (4) Building coalitions across race and class lines.
- (5) Delivering policy outcomes.

An impressive 25-page appendix lists all of the policy outcomes by issue area that each of the three national networks and their local affiliates have achieved since 1990, quantified where possible in terms of dollar value and number of beneficiaries. An "agenda setting" appendix also documents every policy proposal introduced by each of the four local groups, highlighting the impact groups have when they reframe issues and offer innovative solutions, even if those proposals have yet to be adopted.

Foundations that support organizing have sought to quantify the impact of their grantees' work and even have tried **estimating a return on investment** for the foundation's contributions to those impacts.

- The Jewish Funds for Justice (JFJ) examined five years of grants by obtaining information on victories and associated dollar values from a random sample of 45 grantees.<sup>21</sup> JFJ then extrapolated the results to its full portfolio of grantees. The foundation estimated conservatively that five million people benefited from all of its grantees' victories. JFJ concluded that its distribution of \$5 million in grants over five years contributed to \$2 billion in benefits, or a ratio of \$1 to \$500. When outliers were removed from a few huge wins, the return on investment was more modest but still impressive—\$1 to \$50.
- In 2003, the Needmor Fund undertook a similar analysis of grantees based on a four-year grant cycle, using a purposive sampling technique to collect data from a cross-section of types of grantees.<sup>22</sup> The self-reported data from 18 grantees indicated that over four years the groups had grown their membership collectively by more than 30 percent and their leadership by 53 percent. The aggregate dollar amount of their wins totaled more than \$1.37 billion. Needmor's investment of \$2,688,500 therefore generated a return on investment of \$1 to \$512—very close to the figure calculated independently by JFJ.
- A third national social justice grantmaker, the Solidago Foundation, subsequently performed a similar calculation, using data from survey responses by half of its grantees, as well as from progress reports for all grantees.<sup>23</sup> Solidago refined the methodology to discount the value of the grantee victories based on whether the group deserved full or shared credit for the win and to discount the foundation's contribution based on what proportion of the group's budget Solidago's grant represented. When the grant

contributions were discounted as a proportion of organizational budget, the ratio of funder investment to impact was \$1 to \$59—close to the more conservative return on investment that JFJ calculated.

Recent multiyear efforts by funders to invest in and **evaluate the impacts of community organizing** have made important contributions to the field. The Ford Foundation commissioned an evaluation of its Community Organizing Initiative,<sup>24</sup> which provided resources to local community organizing groups through local and regional funders in Los Angeles, Chicago, the South, Denver and Florida (Miami-Dade and Central/East Central Florida). Researchers at the CUNY Howard Samuels Center developed outcome measures for the sites: strengthened organizational capacity as measured by increased membership, funding and organizational leadership; heightened prominence of community organizations in policy debates as indicated by participation in formal policy discussions, policy victories, number of issues and media coverage; greater networking of community organizations within their regions as reflected in the number of meetings across organizations and the number of coalitions; and increased funding support for community organizing groups, measured by the number of local, regional and national funders supporting groups, and establishment of a funders collaborative. Although variations existed among the individual groups, the authors concluded that each site demonstrated measurable success in all four areas.

The Charles Stewart Mott Foundation commissioned a six-year study to measure the impact of community organizing for school reform on student outcomes. The Annenberg Institute for School Reform reported significant findings,<sup>25</sup> which demonstrated improved school–community relationships, parent involvement, sense of school community and trust, teacher collegiality and teacher morale. The four sites with sustained implementation of school-level reform demonstrated improved student outcomes, as measured by higher attendance, improved test scores, increased graduation rates and greater college aspirations. Participation in organizing increased adult and youth members’ civic engagement and their knowledge of and investment in education issues. Youth participation in a community organizing group was a statistically significant predictor of school motivation. The findings also demonstrated that organizing groups that successfully influenced school district decision making were viewed as legitimate, credible and tactically effective by local education officials. The groups were identified as “crucial voices” in education reform and were credited by administrators with having helped achieve school-level gains.

The Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform also showed the value of organizing for school reform in its study of five organizing groups.<sup>26</sup> Community organizing added significant value to school reform efforts by: sustaining the vision and momentum for change over time; being persistent despite potential setbacks; building the political capital and political will that motivates officials to act; and creating authentic policy and program changes that reflect the concerns of the community. The Campaign developed a theory of change and set of eight indicators to measure the impacts of school organizing: leadership development, community power, social capital, public accountability, equity, school-community connections, curriculum and instruction, and school climate.

The exciting work recently undertaken to measure the impact of organizing is evolving on a track somewhat parallel to advances in advocacy evaluation, which are described below. Common themes are emerging between the two, such as the use of theories of change to guide work, the use of indicators that capture policy wins as well as interim benchmarks, and the importance of measuring capacity-building steps. Not surprisingly, the organizing literature places greater

emphasis on leadership development and civic engagement.<sup>27</sup> While organizing long has focused on these more qualitative aspects of the work, recent literature emphasizes quantification and return on investment approaches as well, perhaps because organizing still is seen as less tangible and more amorphous than strict policy advocacy work.

### Advocacy Evaluation

Over the last several years, tremendous strides have been made in the field of advocacy evaluation. There has been a proliferation of reports, guides and tools to help funders understand what advocacy is, what they and their grantees legally can do to engage in and support advocacy, and how to evaluate its success. While this body of work applies to advocacy, specifically public policy advocacy, and not explicitly to community organizing, many of the strategies that community organizing groups use to achieve change can be included under the umbrella of advocacy (research and policy formulation, media outreach, educating legislators, reframing public debate, etc.), making many of these resources relevant for organizing as well.

In 2004, Alliance for Justice (AFJ) published a guide for funders interested in supporting advocacy.<sup>28</sup> According to AFJ, “advocacy” encompasses a broad range of activities that can influence public policy, including research, policy analysis, public education, lobbying and non-partisan voter engagement. Avenues for advocacy include the executive branch (regulations, enforcement of laws, executive orders, administrative policy and program implementation), judicial branch, legislative branch and electoral process. Permitted non-partisan electoral activities include voter registration,<sup>29</sup> voter education (such as candidate questionnaires, voting report cards, candidate debates), and get-out-the-vote (GOTV) efforts. Cross-cutting activities include public education via brochures, flyers, rallies, web sites and blogs, media outreach (letters to the editor, opinion-editorials, articles, paid ads, press conferences, relationship-building with members of media), research, convening stakeholders and organizing. The publication provides a clear understanding of the laws that govern these nonpartisan activities, all of which are legal for public charities to engage in, with certain limits on lobbying, and most of which are legal for foundations to fund.<sup>30</sup>

The guidebook also includes detailed benchmarks for evaluating the success of advocacy efforts. The authors noted that there can be many challenges to evaluating advocacy, such as: long-term, systemic goals; incremental uneven successes; external factors that are hard to predict or control; fluid processes that require flexible measures of success; difficulty measuring relationships and influence with decision makers; and difficulty determining individual credit for outcomes. The guide makes the important point that even if a policy goal is not achieved, there are many outcomes that are important to measure, such as increased knowledge of political process, awareness-raising around an issue, leadership that was developed, etc. These outcomes build the capacity of organizations and increase their likelihood of succeeding in the next advocacy effort, which is why losing an advocacy campaign the first time should not be viewed narrowly as a “failure.” The Alliance emphasized this approach by grouping advocacy evaluation benchmarks as follows:

- Outcome benchmarks (a policy or nonpartisan electoral result achieved)
- Progress benchmarks (key activities accomplished and incremental results obtained toward an advocacy outcome)
- Capacity-building benchmarks (things that strengthen an organization’s ability to advocate).<sup>31</sup>

In the ensuing years, there has been some innovative collaboration as experts and funders have worked together to produce reports and tools that advance thinking in this area, including Blueprint Research & Design, the California Endowment, GrantCraft, the Ford Foundation, the Harvard Family Research Project, the James Irvine Foundation, Organizational Research Services, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Innovation Network, the Aspen Institute Global Interdependence Initiative's Continuous Progress, The Urban Institute/Center for What Works, and others. This growing literature offers several new methods for evaluating advocacy. Many experts agree that funders and grantees each should have a theory of change or logic model that lays out what they hope to accomplish and how to get there. There is a clear consensus around the value of tracking outcome, interim, and capacity-building benchmarks. There are a range of models for developing outcome measures related to the stages of a policy campaign. The number and types of stages vary by model but typically include things like framing, public awareness, base-building, alliances, policy change, policy implementation, and impact of policy on people. Several of these were summarized by Blueprint Research & Design<sup>32</sup> and by the Harvard Family Research Project.<sup>33</sup> Innovative techniques for measuring advocacy outcomes include intense period debriefs, bellwethers, domain leaders, and Most Significant Change.<sup>34</sup>

Whatever the benchmarks and methods of measurement, there is agreement that the context for engaging in policy work is important to consider when gauging success—in a tough policy environment, success may look very different than it would in a more friendly landscape. Also, in assessing impact, it is important that funders and advocacy groups seek to understand their *contribution* to a policy change, rather than try to make a causal link between one grant or one group's work and the policy outcome, which is extremely difficult to do, especially when several funders and/or groups collaborate in their advocacy effort.

Several authors argue that traditional program evaluation methods that use a retrospective approach are ill-suited to evaluating advocacy. For example, these approaches fail to provide timely information that organizations can incorporate to adjust their strategy during the policy campaign. There also is debate about the extent to which evaluations that use quantifiable metrics, such as return-on-investment, are appropriate or useful. For example, the GrantCraft guide to advocacy funding notes that some proponents of advocacy funding see value in calculating a return on investment when possible, to show how philanthropic dollars are leveraging other kinds of public and private investments.<sup>35</sup> On the other hand, this approach can work against the above emphasis on contribution, rather than attribution, and as Allison Fine argues, it does not necessarily focus on measures that are useful for an organization's day-to-day work.<sup>36</sup> Yet, for funders who are not currently funding advocacy but may be interested in doing so, these types of measures can persuade them that it's a worthwhile strategy to support.<sup>37</sup> As noted above, several funders have employed return on investment calculations with their community organizing grantee portfolios.

---

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> See chapter 2 of Bass, Gary D., David F. Arons, Kay Guinane, Matthew F. Carter. *Seen but Not Heard: Strengthening Nonprofit Advocacy*, The Aspen Institute: Washington, DC, 2007

<sup>2</sup> Nonprofit Sector Strategy Group, "The Nonprofit Contribution to Civic Participation and Advocacy," The Aspen Institute: Washington, DC, Fall 2000 (pp. 5–6)

<sup>3</sup> Independent Sector and the Foundation Center, *Social Justice Grantmaking: A Report on Foundation Trends*, 2005.

- 
- <sup>4</sup> Pittz, Will and Rinku Sen, *Shortchanged: Foundation Giving and Communities of Color*, Applied Research Center, p. 8.
- <sup>5</sup> Bass et al., *Seen but Not Heard*
- <sup>6</sup> Greenhouse, Linda, "In a 6-to-3 Vote, Justices Uphold a Voter ID Law," New York Times, April 29, 2008
- <sup>7</sup> Putnam, Robert D. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster, 2000
- <sup>8</sup> See Putnam, *Bowling Alone*, and Halpern, David. *Social Capital*. Polity Press: Cambridge, UK, 2005
- <sup>9</sup> Skocpol, Theda. *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*. University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, 2003
- <sup>10</sup> Putnam quantified the drop in social capital since the 1960s based on voting patterns, involvement in voluntary associations, church attendance, union membership, participation in social clubs (e.g., bowling leagues, card playing), levels of altruism and volunteerism, and perceptions of honesty and trust.
- <sup>11</sup> See McLean, Scott L, David A. Schultz, and Manfred B. Steger, eds. *Social Capital*. New York University Press: New York and London, 2002
- <sup>12</sup> See Sirianni, Carmen and Lewis Friedland. *Civic Innovation in America: Community Empowerment, Public Policy, and the Movement for Civic Renewal*. University of California Press, 2001. Also Swarts, Heidi J. *Organizing Urban America: Secular and Faith-Based Progressive Movements*. University of Minnesota Press, 2008 and Orr, Marion, ed. *Transforming the City: Community Organizing and the Challenge of Political Change*. University Press of Kansas, 2007
- <sup>13</sup> Putnam included a faith-based community organizing group among 12 case studies of new social capital formation in his follow-up book, co-authored with Lewis M. Feldstein and Don Cohen, *Better Together: Restoring the American Community*, Simon & Schuster: New York, 2003.
- <sup>14</sup> Herman, Robert D. and David O. Renz. *Advancing nonprofit organizational effectiveness research and theory: Nine theses* Nonprofit Management and Leadership, Volume 18, Issue 4, Pages 399 - 415
- <sup>15</sup> Skocpol, *Diminished Democracy*, p 274.
- <sup>16</sup> Warren, Mark R. and Richard L. Wood. *Faith-Based Community Organizing: The State of the Field*. Jericho, NY: Interfaith Funders, 2001
- <sup>17</sup> Speer, Paul W. *Evaluation Report—People Making Public Policy in California: The PICO California Project*. Human and Organizational Development, Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, May 2002
- <sup>18</sup> Swarts, *Organizing Urban America*, p. 166-68
- <sup>19</sup> Ranghelli, Lisa. *The Monetary Impact of ACORN Campaigns: A Ten Year Retrospective, 1995-2004*. Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, November 2006.
- <sup>20</sup> Swarts, *Organizing Urban America*
- <sup>21</sup> Jewish Fund for Justice. *Report on Outcomes of JFJ Grantmaking 1996-2001*, May 2003 (draft report)
- <sup>22</sup> Ranghelli, Lisa. *Program Assessment Executive Summary*, Needmor Fund, 2004  
[http://www.needmorfund.org/special\\_report.htm](http://www.needmorfund.org/special_report.htm)
- <sup>23</sup> Solidago Foundation. *Community Benefits Report Brief*, 2008 <http://www.solidago.org/>
- <sup>24</sup> Gittel, Marilyn et al. *Assessing Community: An Evaluation of the Ford Foundation's Community Organizing Initiative, Volume II (2004-2007)*. Howard Samuels Center, The Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York, 2007
- <sup>25</sup> Mediratta, Kavitha et al. *Organized Communities, Stronger Schools: a Preview of Research Findings*. Community Involvement Program, Annenberg Institute for School Reform, Brown University, March 2008
- <sup>26</sup> Research for Action and Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform. *Strong Neighborhoods, Strong Schools: The Indicators Project on Education Organizing. Successful Community Organizing for School Reform*, March 2002
- <sup>27</sup> There are a number of efforts underway to develop rigorous metrics and best practices related to voter engagement activities, including by the Funders' Committee for Civic Participation, State Voices, and the Analyst Institute.
- <sup>28</sup> Alliance for Justice. *Investing in Change*
- <sup>29</sup> Federal tax law imposes certain restrictions on the ability of private foundations to fund voter registration drives. For more information on these requirements, refer to page 18 of *Investing in Change*.
- <sup>30</sup> See Chapter 2 of *Investing in Change* for more information about the rules for funding lobbying.
- <sup>31</sup> See Alliance For Justice, *Build Your Advocacy Grantmaking: Advocacy Evaluation Tool and Advocacy Capacity Assessment Tool*, 2005.
- <sup>32</sup> Blueprint Research & Design, "The Challenge of Assessing Policy and Advocacy Activities: Strategies for a Prospective Evaluation Approach," The California Endowment, October 2005

---

<sup>33</sup> The Evaluation Exchange (13)1, Harvard Family Research Project, Spring 2007. The entire issue is devoted to the topic of advocacy and policy evaluation.

<sup>34</sup> Davies, Rick and Jess Dart, *The 'Most Significant Change' (MSC) Technique: A Guide to Its Use*, April 2005

<sup>35</sup> Proscio, Tony, *Advocacy Funding: The Philanthropy of Changing Minds*, Grantcraft, 2005

<sup>36</sup> The Evaluation Exchange (13)1, Harvard Family Research Project, Spring 2007, page 24.

<sup>37</sup> The Evaluation Exchange (13)1, Harvard Family Research Project, Spring 2007, page 32.